

## REMARKS

Claims 18 to 34 are pending in the application.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 18-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons of record.

The last two lines of claim 18 have been rewritten so as to clarify the engagement set forth therein.

In regard to claims 22 to 34 all reciting "locking device" in line 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims do indeed refer to the locking device itself being claimed and not to the vehicle; the reference to the "vehicle according to claim 18" was made in order to reference limitations of another claim without creating a dependent claim. See **MPEP 2173.05(f) Reference to Limitations in Another Claim:**

*"A claim which makes reference to a preceding claim to define a limitation is an acceptable claim construction which should not necessarily be rejected as improper or confusing under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. For example, claims which read: "The product produced by the method of claim 1." or "A method of producing ethanol comprising contacting amylose with the culture of claim 1 under the following conditions ....." are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, merely because of the reference to another claim. See also Ex parte Porter, 25 USPQ2d 1144 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992) where reference to "the nozzle of claim 7" in a method claim was held to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. However, where the format of making reference to limitations recited in another claim results in confusion, then a rejection would be proper under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph."*

In order to avoid confusion, claim 22 has been rewritten to include language as to the limitations of the vehicle. By doing so, the limitations "backbow"; "top compartment lid"; "connecting member"; "counter member"; "through opening"; "receiving slot" have antecedence in the preamble or are properly introduced in the body of the claim.

The claims dependent on claim 22 have been revised in order to have consistent language as regards "at least two support legs".

The "counter member" of claims 23, 24, 27 has antecedence in claim 22.

In regard to claim 28, the claim introduced "two flap parts" for the first time. Claims 29 to 34 depend from claim 28 and therefore have antecedence for "two flap parts".

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 18 to 34 under 35 USC 112 are respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Claims 18 to 34 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

The claims have been rewritten in view of examiner's remarks and are believed to have overcome the rejections.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further objections or suggestions, the undersigned would appreciate a phone call or **e-mail** from the examiner to discuss appropriate amendments to place the application into condition for allowance.

**Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.**

Authorization is herewith given to charge any fees or any shortages in any fees required during prosecution of this application and not paid by other means to Patent and Trademark Office deposit account 50-1199.

Respectfully submitted on April 30, 2008,

/Gudrun E. Hockett/

---

Ms. Gudrun E. Hockett, Ph.D.  
Patent Agent, Registration No. 35,747  
Schubertstr. 15a  
42289 Wuppertal, GERMANY  
Telephone: +49-202-257-0371  
Facsimile: +49-202-257-0372  
gudrun.draudt@t-online.de

GEH